

U.S. Serial No. 10/661,741
Filed: September 12, 2003
Amendment and Response to Office Action dated 03/08/06
Page 13

REMARKS

This Amendment is a full and timely response to the Office Action dated March 8, 2006.

Claims 1-8, 10-21, 23-30 and 34-44 have been amended. Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 1-44 will be pending in this application.

In the March 8, 2006 Office Action, the Examiner rejected all claims 1-44. For the reasons set forth below, Applicants believe that the rejections should be withdrawn and that the claims are in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-44 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,567,103 (“Chaudhry”) and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0229640 (“Carlson”). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Chaudhry relates to a method of creating a graphical presentation, such as a video, based on surfing the results of a web search. Chaudhry discloses search engine software that in response to a search query from a user performs a database search to locate documents that match the query of the user. Chaudhry further discloses that the search engine software may formulate the document results into a list including a ranking for each document and return the list to the user. The Examiner correctly finds that Chaudhry does not disclose the use of population information to rank documents in search results.

U.S. Serial No. 10/661,741
Filed: September 12, 2003
Amendment and Response to Office Action dated 03/08/06
Page 14

Carlson relates to parallel database query processing for non-uniform data sources via buffered access. Carlson discloses the use of a dynamically-populated query buffer to facilitate handling a portion of a database query in parallel. As disclosed in Carlson, the query is implemented using two portions to enable both portions to be executed in parallel. Carlson discloses the use of a query buffer that is dynamically populated with records from a data source by executing the first portion of the query. Carlson does not disclose the use of population information to rank documents in search results.

Claims 1 and 23 have been amended to more clearly define the invention. Chaudhry and Carlson do not alone or in combination disclose or suggest the invention as claimed in amended claims 1 and 23. For example, Chaudhry and Carlson do not disclose or suggest identifying a population group associated with the user associated with the search query or determining a ranking score for an article based at least in part on a population signal for the article that is based at least in part on the first population group. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1 and 23.

Claims 2-22 and 24-44 depend from claims 1 and 23 respectively and are patentable over Chaudhry and Carlson for at least the same reasons as stated above for claims 1 and 23. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 2-22 and 24-44.

U.S. Serial No. 10/661,741
Filed: September 12, 2003
Amendment and Response to Office Action dated 03/08/06
Page 15

CONCLUSION

The foregoing is submitted as a full and complete response to the Office Action of March 8, 2006. Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner believes that there are any issues that can be resolved by a telephone conference, or that there are any informalities that can be corrected by an amendment, please call 404 815 6061.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Turton
Reg. No. 40,852

Date: June 8, 2006
KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP
1100 Peachtree Street, Suite 2800
Atlanta, Georgia 30309-4530
Phone: 404 815 6061